

RESPONSE

This is a response to the Office Action dated January 9, 2006. The Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite. In addition the Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,666,568 ("DaCosta"). Applicant appreciates the Examiner's allowance of claim 4-12.

The rejections from the Office Action of January 9, 2006 are discussed below. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite. The Office Action of January 9, 2006 states that claim 4 is indefinite based on the use of the word "potentially," however, that word is not in claim 4. Claim 3 does use the phrase "potentially related." Based on this and the fact that claims 4-12 were allowed, the Applicant assumes the indefiniteness rejection pertains to the claim 3. Claim 3 has been amended with this response to remove the word "potentially."

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,666,568 ("DaCosta"). With this response, claim 1 has been amended. The amendment is for clarity and is unrelated to patentability purposes.

DaCosta discloses an "interactive web crawler will be able to create a search query string for any one of a number of desired search topics and systematically crawl dynamic personalized content on a website and retrieve the information desired by the user/client." DaCosta, Abstract. DaCosta fails to disclose the steps of "identifying guest content associated with the host content based on the search query in the index of guest content; and providing the host content and at least a reference to at least some of the guest content with the host content returned in response to the request." as in amended claim 1. DaCosta does disclose searching for content by performing a search query. However, a search for guest content is not disclosed. The search in DaCosta is only for the host content that is requested by the user. In amended claim 1, the

request for host content is used to search for associated guest content and at least some of the associated guest content may then be provided the user.


DaCosta does disclose multiple search queries based on a search request. Col. 8, l. 57 – Col. 9, l. 4. However, the additional search queries are related to the original request such that the Result Manager provides a user with all results and additional topics to be searched related to the host content. *Id.* There is no disclosure of identifying guest content associated with the host content or providing at least a reference to at least some of the guest content as in amended claim 1. For the reasons described above, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 as amended is allowable. Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for the same reasons as with claim 1.

III. CONCLUSION

Each of the rejections in the Office Action dated January 9, 2006 has been addressed and no new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 10, 2006



Scott A. Timmerman
Registration No. 55,678
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200